

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 28-34, 37-48, 50-56, 60-61, and 63 are pending in the application. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 28, 39, 51, and 63 have been amended; no claims have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; and no new claims are added. Applicants believe that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended and/or cancelled various claims solely for purposes of expediting prosecution of this Application. Applicants expressly reserve the right to prosecute the subject matter of any claim pending prior to the foregoing Amendment, or any other subject matter supported by the Specification, in one or more continuation and/or divisional applications.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Duc Dinh for granting Applicants' representative an Examiner Interview on October 19, 2009 ("Examiner Interview"). During the Examiner Interview, Applicants' representative discussed the claims and reference relied upon by the Examiner as discussed below.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 28-34, 37-48, 50-56, 60, 61 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,781,172 to Engle *et al.* ("Engle"). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reason that Engle fails to disclose all the features of the claims pending prior to the foregoing Amendment. Nonetheless, solely to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify various features of the claimed invention.

More particularly, Engle does not disclose at least the feature of "an actuator coupled to the housing and configured to output haptic feedback to the sphere via the at least one roller based on the sensor signals, ***wherein any force to assist or resist motion of the sphere is supplemental to the haptic feedback that is***

output via the at least one roller” as recited in claim 28 as amended. Claims 39, and 51 have been amended to recite similar features.

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner asserted that accelerator (45) and brake (35) vibrates wheel (32) of Engle at Figure 2, thereby allegedly disclosing “vibrating at least one roller” as claimed. However, as discussed during the Examiner Interview, the acceleration (assistive) and deceleration (resistive) force on wheel (32) is different from the vibrating as claimed. For example, the Specification clearly describes that assistive and resistive motion on the sphere may be supplemental to (i.e., different from) the vibrations as claimed. See, e.g., *Specification* at page 21, lines 29-32 and page 22, lines 1-10. As previously noted, Applicants have amended the claims solely to expedite prosecution of this application and to recite that the haptic effect from the actuator as claimed is via the at least one roller and that *any force to assist or resist motion of the sphere is supplemental to the haptic feedback that is output via the at least one roller*. Engle fails to disclose at least this feature of the claims as amended. For at least this reason, Engle fails to disclose all the features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claims 29-34, 37, 38, 40-48, 52-56, 60 and 61 depend from and add additional features to claims 28, 39, or 51. The rejections of these dependant claims must be withdrawn for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to the claims from which they depend.

Furthermore, claim 63 recites: “an actuator coupled to the housing, wherein the actuator comprises at least one moving portion that is configured to output haptic feedback to the sphere by impacting the sphere with the at least one moving portion, ***wherein any force to assist or resist motion of the sphere is supplemental to the haptic feedback from the impacting.***” Engle does not disclose at least this feature of claim 63 as amended. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 63 is improper and must be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the Application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **October 21, 2009**

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Hean L. Koo
Registration No. 61,214

Customer No. 26158

WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037
Main: 404-872-7000
Direct Dial: 703-394-2274
Fax: 404-888-7490